DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 155 CG 020 088

AUTHOR Locke, William E.
TITLE Staff Development Concerns for the Personnel Manager.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; *Inservice Education; *Personnel Management; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The most unique responsibility of the school personnel worker may be the evaluation of teachers. Unlike the personnel manager of a non-educational enterprise, a school personnel manager must provide remediation training to a tenured teacher not performing competently. Those involved in personnel decisions should be aware of what research has determined to be the best facilitators of inservice staff development. Local school districts are being mandated to upgrade their curricula and the skills of their teachers. A melding of teacher-effectiveness discoveries and operationally sound management strategies is necessary to the successful fulfillment of the mandated education goals. Teachers must be encouraged to make changes that will improve institutions; they need to be called on to set goals and make decisions. Critical to attempts to improve schooling is the involvement of teachers in large-scale innovations such as the use of computers, and teacher participation in comprehensive, long-term computer inservice programs have been recommended by researchers. Inservice programs should be based on needs expressed by teachers themselves, thereby developing an attitude of "ownership" by the teachers that leads to greater teacher effectiveness. Although the research seems conclusive that participation in the content of inservice programs by teachers is essential, there is a reluctance among administrators to fully involve teachers in planning and developing inservice programs. School personnel managers need to make use of this research and incorporate teacher preferences into programs intended to enchance teacher competency. (ABL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William E. Locke
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED284155

# STAFF DEVELOPMENT CONCERNS FOR THE PERSONNEL MANAGER

By
William E. Locke

Of the four main areas of the personnel person's responsibilities, the one most unique to the school personnel person is that involving the evaluation of teachers. This has become increasingly the case as unions have developed, tenure laws have emerged, the body of effectiveness teaching research has grown, and the reform movements have impacted on the schools. Recruitment, selection, and assignment procedures and practices of the education and lay worlds, while obviously distinct from each other in many specifics, share many commonalities. The area of teacher evaluation, especially with its accompanying responsibilities for providing opportunities and guidance for professional improvement of teachers in need of remediation, however, calls for a different perspective, with a different set of operational prerogatives.

The personnel manager of a non-educational enterprise might want to provide some inservice instruction for a veteran employee who is not doing an effective job. However, he doesn't have to. On the other hand, the personnel manager in a school (whatever his/her actual title might be) has no choice. If in the summative evaluation of a tenured teacher, the personnel manager finds reasons to believe that teacher is not performing in a competent manner, the employee cannot immediately be fired, but must be put in a Remediation program.

Growing out of his or her responsibilities in evaluating personnel, the personnel manager often finds additional duties in the general area of staff development. Harris et al. (1985) said:

CG020088

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> In cases in which there is no plan or set of procedures for this type of support and training, it is suggested that the personnel administrators assume the responsibility for initiating such efforts. The services are needed in the organization, and if they have not been designated as the responsibility of some organizational unit, the personnel department could legitimately accept the assignement. (p. 144)

That it is, indeed, a legitimate assignment for the personnel department or person to become involved in staff development is seen again as Harris spells out the advantages of having a promotion plan which is closely tied to district guides and plans which facilitate professional growth activities. Such a comprehensive program makes a multifaceted contribution to the individual--and ultimately to the school district and its clients, the students.

> 1. The individual gains a new appreciation for the openness of the organization.
>
> 2. The individual is often stimulated to explore and aspire.
>
> 3. The individual feels more a part of the larger organization.
>
> 4. The individual gets new options in his or her career within or outside the system. (p. 142)

Because of the close relationships among evaluation, professional development, and career growth, it behooves anyone involved with personnel decisions and management to be aware of the literature concerning what research has determined to be the best facilitators of inservice staff development.

Current popular and governmental concerns about the state of education in our country have spawned a complex array of programs aimed at improving the school's product. Whether in agreement or not, local school districts are being mandated to upgrade their curricula and the skills of their teachers. The urgency accompanying the push for the implementation of these actions leads to questions about the process by

which changes and improvements might be most quickly and efficiently achieved. The rapidly growing body of information concerning teacher effectiveness provides an excellent source from which to draw insights and ideas for the improvement of the educational milieu--the teacher, the teaching strategies, and the curriculum.

So, too, does data gleaned from research on job satisfaction, personnel management and other closely related subjects provide a wealth of practical guidance for leading teachers into the acquisition of the tools recognized as being most effective in improving the education in their individual classrooms. A melding of teacher-effectiveness discoveries and operationally sound management strategies is necessary to the successful fulfillment of the mandated education goals. This study should provide further support for encouraging the development of inservice practices which are consistent with the realities of the profession and the demands of the time.

Some form of inservice training has been provided for teachers for much of the last century. Teacher Institutes that brought all the teachers from a school district, city, or county together for a day (and decreed a new dress for the occasion, according to my grandmother) were used as a kind of "cheerleading" session and to communicate the latest information and techniques regarding the art of teaching. While these get-togethers were good for providing an opportunity for teachers to socialize, their large-group formal presentations did little to substantively improve teacher effectiveness. We still have Teacher Institutes which are similar to those of the past, presented, perhaps, with a little more sophistication. In the past, too, rural schools located near State Teacher Colleges were invited to participate in what were often called Rural Progress Days. In these events teachers and

students met on the college campus and participated events intended to foster educational improvement. The inservice practices of the past were sincere efforts to improve teacher skills and improve education; however, the efforts often fell far short of their mark.

Led by Rosenshine (1971), Bloom (1976), and Hunter (1976) a rapidly growing body of Teacher Effectiveness literature has emerged. Coupled with increased basal knowledge of "what" effective teaching is has come the development of a methodology for systematically analyzing and evaluating techniques of teacher performance (Popham, 1973 and McGreal, 1983). The goal of all this research and thought has been to effect change in the quality of the final product of the school--learning.

Knowing "what" makes good teaching, and knowing "how" to analyze and evaluate teachers' delivery competencies do not, of themselves, affect the quality of education. Somehow the teacher must be encouraged to make changes or incorporate new ideas that will improve instruction. General studies in management technique have described what approaches work most effectively in bringing about change (Kotter and Schlesinger, 1979). The "Motivation-Hygiene Theory" (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959) and similar models (Maslow, 1954; McGregor, 1960; and Sergiovanni,1967) almost unanimously advocate the recognition of basic human proclivities in efforts to provide job satisfaction and create positive attitudes toward the implementation of change.

Batchler (1981) brings the management world and the education world together when he examines the implications for educators of the "Motivation-Hygiene Theory" proposed by Frederick Herzberg. His findings suggest increasing staff opportunities for goal setting, decision making, and expanded professional competencies as strategies for developing staff motivation. The key here is the clear call for

bringing teachers into an active role by calling on them to set goals and make decisions.

Very much in keeping with the suggestions of Batchler, Sharma (1982) compares many teacher inservice programs to the artificial insemination of cows--when decisions are made without teacher participation, teachers do not get to join in the act, and no one has much fun. She suggests that teachers be allowed to set their goals and control their own learning.

Indeed, the active participation of teachers in all aspects of inservice programs is seen as vital for the success of those programs. Vandenberghe (1984) sees the involvement of teachers in large scale innovations as critical if attempts to improve schooling are to succeed. One innovation that has had a strong impact on the school has been the computer. Meyer (1985) affirms Vandenberghe and like thinkers as he discusses the techniques and strategies for the smooth incorporation of this technological advance into the classroom. He says that teacher participation is necessary for successful implementation of all phases of computer programs. Training, he says, should be made available to both administrators and staff, then a computer committee representative of all interested factions should be established. From this point a philosophy and a plan for the use of the computer should be made--always with the participation and voice of the teachers.

Killian (1985), addressing administrators concerning the lessons from research, admonishes them to make computer inservice programs comprehensive and long-term, and most importantly, to offer opportunities for teacher participation. Responding to Killian's article Rhodes (1985) discusses the increased responsibility placed on administrators as the result of the necessity for an appropriate

environment and opportunities for promoting voluntary technological growth. Environment and opportunities must take into consideration the desire (perhaps, need) for participation by the teacher.

The simplest means of involving teachers in inservice programs is through some form of "needs assessment." Clark and Seidman (1980) saw staff development as the primary vehicle for improving schools and increasing learning, and said that it should be shaped by the needs of the participants at the school site. After reviewing the attitudes toward staff development through inservice education, Byrne (1983) agreed with Clark and Seidman that it is necessary to base inservice programs on needs expressed by teachers. Returning to the concerns prompted by the advent of the computer, Utecht (1983) reported the success of a computer literacy staff development program that evolved from teacher "feedback" following a "one-shot" workshop. The results of a highly successful program to improve teaching in New York City was reported by Mann (1983) and had as one of its guiding principles the solicitation of ideas from teachers. Finally, from a commercial perspective, Pelland and Huling-Austin (1985) describe the process followed by Ginn and Co., who made a commitment in the early 1980's to provide inservice workshops for teachers that more closely related to customer needs. Using sophisticated instruments for assessing teacher needs, Ginn and Co. is able to tailor its inservice programs to the actual needs and problems of the specific participants.

In addition to the content of an inservice program, an area which should be addressed through teacher input is the method of delivery. Von Eschenbach and Noland (1982) present a model that could be used for designing appropriate local models. Darling-Hammond and Wise (1983) report that research findings suggest that methods used to improve

teaching are as important as the goals themselves.

Although almost all the studies addressing inservice programs call for the involvement of the teacher in the developmental process, two articles present findings which should suggest some caution in an unexamined acceptance of that precept. Bany and Carbno (1981) surveyed elementary school mathematics teachers and discovered that one of their least preferred inservice activities was participation on planning committees. Ervay and others (1983) looked at the "current teacher centers" and discovered that some laypersons, teacher educators, and administrators hesitate to endorse any movement that gives teachers added opportunities for self-determination and administrative involvement.

"Ownership" is the operative word in educational jargon today. If teachers are to "buy into" an innovation, they must have a vested interest. How can that feeling of "ownership" be developed? Research suggests that input through a "needs assessment" program and also through participation in the actual planning of the inservice program is fundamental in developing a sense of "ownership" and acceptance.

Literature in the area of teacher partiticpation in the organizing and planning of inservice activities suggests clearly positive results. Von Eschenbach (1980), for one, studied the self-perceived competencies of twenty-one rural middle school teachers who participated in planning an inservice program based on their needs and strengths. He found that twenty of twenty-four measured functions were perceived as significantly increased, based on pre- and post-testing results.

The involvement of teachers in the planning and development of inservice programs has taken many different forms. In Louisiana of individual professional development plans are submitted by school staff

participants (Chachere and Nowatny, 1982). In the Edgewood Independent School District and Trinity University (San Antonio, Texas), classroom teachers at each participating school are trained to lead professional development activities which have been, at least partially, designed by the teachers of each school (Leslie, 1982). Another district, described by Olson and Besch (1983), had a district-wide, year-long staff development program, which focused on developing teachers' critical thinking skills, that was planned and directed by specially-trained local teachers. And, lastly, at Beacon Hill Elementary School in Kelso, Washington, an emphasis on full staff involvement has been the focus of school improvement efforts. To accomplish this goal the school has involved staff in planning, goal setting, and extensive inservice programs to improve instruction (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1985). The individuality of each of these programs reflects the genuine application of the principle of local participation in planning and rendering inservice programs.

The literature seems conclusive: participation in determining the content and nature of inservice programs is essential in the creation of a program that will lead to the acceptance and implementation of teaching strategies that will improve education. Although the research is clear, there is a reluctance among administrators and staff development people to fully involve teachers in the planning and delivery of inservice training. Marso (1984) conducted a study to determine if the emphasis in the literature of the past decade on collaborative planning and needs assessments beyond a teacher survey appears to have influenced administrative receptivity to, or use of, these particular practices. As he suspected, the effect of research on

collaborative planning within educational organizations and the use of more diversified needs assessment approaches has yet to make a significant impact on teacher inservice planning practices.

This review of the literature regarding teacher involvement in inservice program planning clearly points out the efficacy of such activity. It also suggests that involvement in planning produces a positive attitude toward inservice programs. A more positive attitude toward inservice would, in turn, lead more readily to the development of greater teacher effectiveness. The problem lies in the kind of situation described by Marso in the preceding paragraph--even though teacher involvement is undeniably valuable, it isn't always done.

The personnel manager cannot hope to achieve optimum production from inservice programs unless he or she makes use of the available research. Clearly, a conscious effort involving effectiveness teaching findings, proven effective motivational techniques, and teacher preferences must be worked into the fabric of any program intended to enhance the competencies of a district's teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Batchler, Merv. "Motivating Staff: A Problem for the School Administrator," Journal of Educational Administration, 19: 44-54, Winter, 1981.

Bany, Bruce P. and Carbno, W. Clifford. "Preferred Inservice Activities among Teachers of Elementary School Mathematics," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 27: 57-73, March, 1981.

Bloom, Benjamin. Human Characteristics and School Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Byrne, Robert. "Inservice Programs: What are the Essentials for Making Them Effective?" NASSP Bulletin, 67: 1-7, March, 1983.

Chachere, Ernest G. and Nowatny, Fanz A. "The Louisiana PIP Program: An Innovative Step Toward Quality Public Education or an Unmanageable Hydra," Action in Teacher Education, 4: 41-45, Fall, 1982.

Clark, Richard J., Jr. and Seidman, Earl. "Individual Imperatives in Institutional Staff Development," Peabody Journal of Education, 58: 34-38, October, 1980.

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Wise, Arthur E. "Teaching Standards, or Standardized Teaching?" Educational Leadership, 41: 66-69, October, 1983.

Ervay, Stuart, et al. "The Bicameral Teacher Center," Teacher Educator, 19: 7-13, Summer, 1983.

Harris, Ben M. et al. Personnel Administration in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1985.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B. The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Hunter, M. Rx Improved Instruction. El Segundo, California: TIP Publications, 1976.

Killian, Joyce E. "Fostering Computer Competence in Schools," Educational Leadership, 42: 81-83, December/January, 1984/1985.

Kotter, John P. and Schlesinger, Leonard A. "Choosing Strategies for Change," Harvard Business Review, 106-113, March/April, 1979.

Leslie, Jessica B. "Training Teachers To Be Professional Development Leaders," Journal of Staff Development, 3: 66-79, November, 1982.

Mann, Dale. "The Impact of IMPACT II," Teachers' College Record, 84: 837-870, Summer, 1983.

Marso, Ronald N. "Supervisor Assessments of Inservice Education Planning Practices: Collaboration and Competency Concerns," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association: Chicago, September 26-29, 1984.

McGreal, Thomas L. Successful Teacher Evaluation. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. "Beacon Hill Elementary Staff Involvement Leads to Improvements." Portland, Oregon: 1985.

Olson, Julie and Besch, Marsha. "Teachers Teaching Teachers: An Inservice Model for Staff Development and School Improvement," Journal of Staff Development, 4: 101-108, May, 1983.

Pelland, Raymond and Huling-Austin, Leslie. "Installing New Reading Programs: A Business Education Application of Stages of Concern to Mediate Staff Development Efforsts," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association: Chicago, October 4, 1985.

Popham, W. J. Evaluating Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Rhodes, Lewis A. "Voluntary Technological Growth: An Administrative Challenge," Educational Leadership, 42: 84, December/January, 1984/1985.

Rosenshine, Barak. Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement. London: National Foundation For Educational Research, 1971.

Sergiovanni, T. J. "Clinical Supervision and Teacher Evaluation." Urbana: University of Illinois, 1982.

Sharma, Toni. "Inservicing the Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, 63: 403, February, 1982.

Utecht, Greg. "A Staff Developed Plan for Computer Staff Development: Teachers Teach Each Other," Journal of Staff Development, 4: 29-34, November, 1983.

Vandenberghe, Roland. "Teacher's Role in Educational Change," Paper presented at the European Seminar of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession: Athens, Greece, May 6-8, 1984.

Von Eschenbach, John F. "Effects of a Collaborative In-Service Model on Middle School Teachers' Perceptions of Their Professional Competencies," High School Journal, 64: 8-12, October, 1980.

Von Eschenbach, John F. and Noland, Ronald G. "In-Service Delivery System Preferences among Social Studies Teachers," Social Studies, 73: 16-20, January/February, 1982.